

Remarks


By the above amendment, independent claim 25 has been rewritten to replace "corresponding to" with "set forth in". This amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it addresses the Examiner's remarks first made in the final Office Action regarding the interpretation of the claim terminology "corresponding to".

In particular, the Examiner finally rejected claims 25, 26, and 28-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, on two grounds, namely: (i) as containing subject matter not described in the specification as reasonably conveying possession of the claimed subject matter; and (ii) as lacking enablement for the full scope of the claimed subject matter. These claims were also rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite due to the recitation of "corresponding to". Additionally, the claims were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable based on Antalis et al. (WO 98/36054), Samal et al. (US 5,278,062), and Egelrud et al. (US 5,834,290), in view of Hellegren et al. (US 4,801,451). From the Examiner's comments in making these rejections, it is apparent that they all hinge on the recitation of "corresponding to".

Applicant believes that the above amendment obviates each of the outstanding grounds of rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendment and allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 24, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Linda S. Evans  
Reg. No. 33,873

Johnson & Johnson  
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza  
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08933-7003  
(858) 320-3406